

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 66 and 68 are pending. Claims 1-66 and 68 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Veeneman (US 5,754,981).

REMARKS ON CLAIMS REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 102(B)

Claims 1-68 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Veeneman (US 5,754,981).

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1:

Claim 1 stands anticipated by Veeneman. The Applicant disagrees and in the previous response argued that Veeneman discloses a gift registry apparatus and method (title). Gift registries are operated by users to direct other people as to what to buy them and are not intended to aid the user in buying anything themselves. Therefore Veeneman does not include the elements of this claim and fails to anticipate the Claim. Further, Veeneman teaches away from those elements, disqualifying its use in an obviousness argument. The Examiner in this Office Action stated that (page 28 paragraph 3): “the claims do not positively recite this limitation”. In order to expedite prosecution, this Claim is amended to clarify the invention:

1. (currently amended) A system for the presentation of specific marketing presentations to customers in a retail environment, comprising:

an electronic display device providing at least one electronic presentation to a customer in said retail environment wherein said customer selects a product item based upon said electronic presentation for purchase by said user;

a processing system providing said electronic presentation for said electronic display device;

means for said processing system to electronically deliver said electronic presentation to said electronic display device; and

means for selecting a presentation from at least two presentations in a memory and based upon the unique interests and needs of said customer to make available said electronic presentation to said processing system.

Based upon this amendment, the Applicant submits that this Claim now speaks more clearly to the intended limitation, is therefore allowable and requests that this rejection be removed from this Claim.

CLAIMS DEPENDENT UPON CLAIM 1:

Claims 2 to 18 depend upon Claim 1. In addition to being allowable for the novel and nonobvious features contained in them, these Claims are dependent upon Claim 1, inherit its limitations, and are allowable as argued for Claim 1. The Applicant requests that the rejection of these Claims be removed as well.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 19:

Claim 19 stands anticipated by Veeneman. Veeneman. The Applicant disagrees and in the previous response argued that Veeneman discloses a gift registry apparatus and method (title). Gift registries are operated by users to direct other people as to what to buy them and are not intended to aid the user in buying anything themselves. Therefore Veeneman does not include the elements of this claim and fails to anticipate the Claim. Further, Veeneman teaches away from those elements, disqualifying its use in an obviousness argument. The Examiner in this Office Action stated that (page 28 paragraph 3): “the claims do not positively recite this limitation”. In order to expedite prosecution, this Claim is amended to clarify the invention:

*19. (currently amended) A method comprising the step of ~~for the presentation of~~
presenting specific marketing presentations to a customer ~~customers~~ in a retail environment, comprising the steps of:*
providing at least one electronic presentation to a customer by an electronic display device in said retail environment wherein said customer selects a product item based upon said electronic presentation for purchase by said customer;
providing said electronic presentation for said electronic display device by a processing system;
electronically delivering said electronic presentation to said electronic display device from said processing system; and
selecting a presentation from at least two presentations based upon the unique interests and needs of said customer to make available as said electronic presentation to said processing system.

Based upon this amendment, the Applicant submits that this Claim now speaks more clearly to the intended limitation, is therefore allowable and requests that this rejection be removed from this Claim.

CLAIMS DEPENDENT UPON CLAIM 19:

Claims 20 to 40 depend upon Claim 19. In addition to being allowable for the novel and nonobvious features contained in them, these Claims are dependent upon Claim 19, inherit its limitations, and are allowable as argued for Claim 19. The Applicant requests that the rejection of these Claims be removed as well.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 41:

Claim 1 stands anticipated by Veeneman. The Applicant disagrees and in the previous response argued that Veeneman discloses a gift registry apparatus and method (title). Gift registries are operated by users to direct other people as to what to buy them and are not intended to aid the user in buying anything themselves. Therefore Veeneman does not include the elements of this claim and fails to anticipate the Claim. Further, Veeneman away from those elements, disqualifying its use in an obviousness argument. The Examiner in this Office Action stated that (page 28 paragraph 3): “the claims do not positively recite this limitation”. In order to expedite prosecution, this Claim is amended to clarify the invention:

41. (currently amended) An electronic display device, comprising means for providing an electronic presentation to a customer in a retail environment for said customer to select at least one product item based upon said electronic presentation for purchase by said customer,

said electronic display device receiving said electronic presentation from among at least two presentations based upon unique interests and needs of said customer.

Based upon this amendment, the Applicant submits that this Claim now speaks more clearly to the intended limitation, is therefore allowable and requests that this rejection be removed from this Claim.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 42:

Claim 42 stands anticipated by Veeneman. The Applicant disagrees and in the previous response argued that Veeneman discloses a gift registry apparatus and method (title). Gift registries are operated by users to direct other people as to what to buy them and are not intended to aid the user in buying anything themselves. Therefore Veeneman does not include the elements of this claim and fails to anticipate the Claim. Further, Veeneman teaches away from those elements, disqualifying its use in an obviousness argument. The Examiner in this Office Action stated that (page 28 paragraph 3): “the claims do not positively recite this limitation”. In order to expedite prosecution, this Claim is amended to clarify the invention:

42. (currently amended) *A method comprising the step of:*
 using a Customer Interaction Device (CID) by a customer to create a
purchase by said user, including the steps of:
 providing said customer at least one electronic presentation on said CID
in a retail environment; wherein said electronic presentation is based upon the
unique interests and needs of said customer;
 said customer viewing said electronic presentation on said CID;
 said customer selecting at least one new product item based upon said
electronic presentation to create a selected new product item at some point in
time; and
 said customer paying for said selected new product item to create said
purchase by said user with a revenue.

Based upon this amendment, the Applicant submits that this Claim now speaks more clearly to the intended limitation, is therefore allowable and requests that this rejection be removed from this Claim.

CLAIMS DEPENDENT UPON CLAIM 42:

Claims 43 to 66 depend upon Claim 42. In addition to being allowable for the novel and nonobvious features contained in them, these Claims are dependent upon Claim 42, inherit its limitations, and are allowable as argued for Claim 42. The Applicant requests that the rejection of these Claims be removed as well.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 68:

Claim 68 stands anticipated by Veeneman. The Applicant disagrees and in the previous response argued that Veeneman discloses a gift registry apparatus and method (title). Gift registries are operated by users to direct other people as to what to buy them and are not intended to aid the user in buying anything themselves. Therefore Veeneman does not include the elements of this claim and fails to anticipate the Claim. Further, Veeneman teaches away from those elements, disqualifying its use in an obviousness argument. The Examiner in this Office Action stated that (page 28 paragraph 3): “the claims do not positively recite this limitation”. In order to expedite prosecution, this Claim is amended to clarify the invention:

68. (currently amended) A program system comprising of at least one program step residing in a memory accessibly coupled to a computer,

wherein said program system further comprises at least one of the program steps of:

providing a customer at least one electronic presentation on a Customer Interaction Device (CID) in a retail environment customer to create a purchase by said user;

detecting said customer selecting at least one new product item based upon said electronic presentation to create a selected new product item; and

supporting said customer paying for said selected new product item to create said purchase by said user with a revenue.

Based upon this amendment, the Applicant submits that this Claim now speaks more clearly to the intended limitation, is therefore allowable and requests that this rejection be removed from this Claim.

SUMMARY OF THE REMARKS

The rejections of these Claims have been addressed through amendment to address the issued raised by the Examiner to refute the previous response's arguments. These amendments reasonably require the removal of those rejections from the relevant claims. The amended Claims as presented do not introduce new matter, nor do they represent an agreement with the Examiner's rejections of these Claims. The amendments have been made strictly for the purpose of expediting the prosecution of this patent application.

To summarize, the Claims are now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to place this application in that condition. The Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Earle Jennings or Gregory Smith, as listed below, for a telephonic interview if doing so would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Very respectfully submitted,

/Earle Jennings/

Earle Jennings

GSS Law Group

3900 Newpark Mall Rd

Third Floor, Suite 317

Newark, CA 94560

Registration No.: 44,804

Phone (510) 742-7417

Fax (510) 742-7419